DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 644 EC 305 119

AUTHOR	Thousand, Jacqueline
TITLE	Preparation of Special Educators 84.029B. Certificate of Advanced Study Program: Preparing Post-Master's Level Specialists To Support Local School Placement for Students with Moderate and Severe Disabilities within Rural Vermont. Final Report, July 1, 1992 - June 30, 1996.
INSTITUTION	Vermont Univ., Burlington. Univ. Affiliated Program of Vermont.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 96
CONTRACT	H029B20249
NOTE	80p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperative Learning; *Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Inclusive Schools; Mainstreaming; Problem Solving; Professional Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Rural Education; Severe Disabilities; Special Education Teachers; *Specialists; Student Placement; Teacher Collaboration; *Teacher Education Programs; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	Vermont

ABSTRACT

This final report describes a project that prepared 28 integration/support facilitators to work with school district personnel to plan and implement systems change to result in integrated service models for learners with moderate and severe disabilities within their local home schools. The project offered a 30 to 36 credit hour post-Master's Certificate of Advanced Study concentration in the Special Education Department of the University of Vermont and was the only program in northern New England to prepare personnel with skills to plan, establish, and evaluate an integrated service model for learners with moderate and severe disabilities within neighborhood schools. Changes were made in the program to provide preparation which incorporated new best practices in regular education settings, including expanding course work and competencies on: collaborative teaming, creative problem solving, student collaboration, and authentic assessment. The program also required team teaching practicum experiences. Extensive appendices to the report include a summary of course evaluations, a form used to survey graduates, and detailed survey data. (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 400 644

PR/AWARD # HO29B20249

84.029B
PREPARATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATORS

Certificate of Advanced Study Program: Preparing Post-Master's Level Specialists to Support Local School Placement for Students with Moderate and Severe Disabilities within Rural Vermont

FINAL REPORT

July 1, 1992 – June 30, 1996

Jacqueline Thousand, Ph.D. – Project Director

The University Affiliated Program of Vermont
University of Vermont
499C Waterman Building
Burlington, Vermont 05405-0160

EC 305119

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the final report for 84.029B Preparation of Personnel for Careers in Special Education funded from July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1996. This project prepared Integration/Support Facilitators for Learners with Moderate and Severe Handicaps (I/SF) to work with school district personnel to plan and implement systems change to result in integrated service models for learners with moderate and severe disabilities within their local home schools. This project offered a 30 to 36 credit hour post-master's Certificate of Advanced Study (CAS) concentration in the Special Education Department of the University of Vermont. It was the only program in Vermont or northern New England to prepare personnel with skills to plan, establish, and evaluate an integrated service model for learners with moderate and severe disabilities within neighborhood schools.

II. PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To prepare 20 to 36 post-master's level ES-SH educators annually to meet the need for advanced leadership personnel to establish and maintain local school integrated services for learners with moderate and severe disabilities.

III. TRAINING PROGRAM

A. Program Overview

The post-master's CAS concentration was designed to accommodate both full-time and part-time students. Full-time students enrolled in 12 hours of course work and practicum during the Fall and Spring semesters and 6 credit hours during summers. They were released one day per week to attend classes on the university campus. Since part-time students typically worked full-time in public schools, additional course work was scheduled to accommodate their job responsibilities.

B. Final Year Accomplishments

All activities and timelines as specified in the third year continuation grant were met. Eight students completed training by the end of the grant year.

C. Cumulative Accomplishments

A total of 28 students (7 in the first year, 7 in the second, 6 in the third and 8 in the fourth year) were trained over the four year grant period through support of this federal training grant. Twenty of the 29 were supported full-time for at least part of their course of study. As described in detail in the original grant proposal, the I/SF CAS concentration maintained a strong cooperative working relationship with the State Department of Education, the University Affiliated Program of Vermont, and the State Interdisciplinary Team for Special Education.

D. Evaluation Data

A summary of course evaluations for Year 4 are provided in Appendix A. As the evaluations indicate, courses in the program consistently received high ratings. Appendix B includes an in-depth study which was conducted at the beginning of the fourth year in order to determine the highlights and impact of the program with regard to systems change initiatives with which program graduates have been involved. Overall results indicate that program graduates believed themselves to be more effective in collaborating with others and leading change initiatives for inclusive education due to their involvement in this training program.

E. Impact of Evaluation Data on Program Design

The regular education service delivery system in Vermont has undergone tremendous restructuring and has moved away from separate special education service delivery systems that promote segregation of students with and without special needs. Most schools have worked to establish one inclusionary system of regular education through having

regular and special educators collaborate in meeting the needs of all students in regular education curriculum and settings.

The changes in the special and regular education service delivery models and the roles of I/SF personnel created a need to modify the CAS program to provide preparation which incorporated new best practices in regular education settings for **all** students into its curriculum; expand course work and competencies on collaborative teaming, creative problem solving and student collaboration (e.g., partner learning, cooperative learning, students as advocates for themselves and others), and authentic assessment; and require team teaching practicum experiences.

APPENDIX A

Summary of Course Evaluations

PECD COURSE STUDENT EVALUATION
Scale: 5 being highest, 1 being lowest

EDSP 386
Spring 1996

Jacqueline Thousand
4 students reporting

		Mean	Range
1.	Objectives clarified by instructor	4.50	3.00-5.00
2.	Organization of course	5.00	5.00
3.	Knowledge of subject	5.00	5.00
4.	Interest in subject	5.00	5.00
5.	Intellectual Stimulation	5.00	5.00
6.	Assignments	4.75	4.00-5.00
7.	Ability to arouse interest	4.75	4.00-5.00
8.	Skill in guiding the leaning process	4.75	4.00-5.00
9.	Presentation of subject	4.75	4.00-5.00
10.	Fairness in grading	4.75	4.00-5.00
11.	Willingness to help	4.75	4.00-5.00
12.	Attitude toward students	4.75	4.00-5.00
13.	Personal attention to student product	4.75	4.00-5.00
14.	General estimate of the teacher	5.00	5.00
15.	General estimate of the course	5.00	5.00

FECD COURSE EVALUATION

1.WHAT TO YOU WERE THE MOST BENEFICIAL ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE?

Intensive Special Education, Integration Facilitator.

2.WHAT ASPECTS OF THE COURSE DO YOU FEEL SHOULD BE IMPROVED UPON OR DELETED?
PLEASE INDICATE REASON FOR IMPROVEMENT OR DELETIONS.

3.DO YOU FEEL THAT ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE COURSE? IF SO, PLEASE INDICATE THESE ACTIVITIES.

The major strengths of the program are the instructors. Excellent!

4.WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE TO OTHER STUDENTS? WHY?

Wish it were available at a variety of locations throughout Vermont.

PECD COURSE STUDENT EVALUATION
Scale: 5 being highest, 1 being lowest

EDSP 323
Spring 1996

Jacqueline Thousand
3 students reporting

		Mean	Range
1.	Objectives clarified by instructor	5.00	5.00
2.	Organization of course	4.67	4.00-5.00
3.	Knowledge of subject	4.67	4.00-5.00
4.	Interest in subject	4.67	4.00-5.00
5.	Intellectual Stimulation	4.67	4.00-5.00
6.	Assignments	4.33	4.00-5.00
7.	Ability to arouse interest	4.67	4.00-5.00
8.	Skill in guiding the leaning process	4.67	4.00-5.00
9.	Presentation of subject	4.67	4.00-5.00
10.	Fairness in grading	4.67	4.00-5.00
11.	Willingness to help	5.00	5.00
12.	Attitude toward students	5.00	5.00
13.	Personal attention to student product	5.00	5.00
14.	General estimate of the teacher	5.00	5.00
15.	General estimate of the course	5.00	5.00

PECD COURSE EVALUATION

1.*WHAT TO YOU WERE THE MOST BENEFICIAL ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE?*

Individualism, application of theory.

The applicability of information learned in class to my school situation was the most beneficial aspect of this course.

2.*WHAT ASPECTS OF THE COURSE DO YOU FEEL SHOULD BE IMPROVED UPON OR DELETED?*
PLEASE INDICATE REASON FOR IMPROVEMENT OR DELETIONS.

None

3.*DO YOU FEEL THAT ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE COURSE? IF SO, PLEASE INDICATE THESE ACTIVITIES.*

No

4.*WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE TO OTHER STUDENTS? WHY?*

I would and have! Courses like this are rare but sorely needed. It is like having a mentor available to help you make significant difference in your school.

Yes.

Student Evaluation of
EDSP 380
Fall 1995
Prof. Jacqueline Thousand

1. What to you were the most beneficial aspects of this course?

Networking with other professionals. Being aware of latest journals, professionals and theories. Using each other as resources.

Teacher support!

The direct applicability to my real-life job was the most important/beneficial aspect.

2. What aspects of the course do you feel should be improved upon or deleted? Please indicate reason for improvement or deletion.

Perfect.

3. Do you feel that additional activities should be added to the course? If so, please indicate these activities.

No.

4. Would you recommend this course to other students? Why?

Yes, and I have because the course provides excellent information, practical application.

Yes.

Yes. It's great to gain information about schools across the State and tap into the experience of others.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey: Education Course Evaluation

Report: Frequency Text (Subgroup Only)

Date: Friday, May 10, 1996

Respondent Selection:

Respondents in Batches:

EDSP380 Thousand Fall 1995: 4

No subgroups selected.

Item: 1

Text: Objective clarified by Instructor

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 2

Text: Organization of Course

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	3	75.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	25.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.75
Std Dev:	0.50
Median:	5.00

Item: 3

Text: Knowledge of subject

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	3	75.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	25.0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 4.75
Std Dev: 0.50
Median: 5.00

Item: 4

Text: Interest in Subject

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 5

Text: Intellectual Stimulation

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item: 6

Text: Assignments

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 7

Text: Ability to arouse interest

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 8

Text: Skill in guiding the learning process

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	3	75.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	25.0%

4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 4.75
Std Dev: 0.50
Median: 5.00

Item: 9

Text: Presentation of Subject

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 10

Text: Fairness in Grading

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 11

Text: Willingness to help

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 12

Text: Attitude toward Students

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	3	75.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	25.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.75
Std Dev:	0.50
Median:	5.00

Item: 13

Text: Personal attention to Student product

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 14

Text: General estimate of the teacher

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	4	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 15

Text: General Estimate of the course

Subgroup: N/A (4 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	3	75.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	25.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		4	

Missing: 0
Mean: 4.75
Std Dev: 0.50
Median: 5.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Department of Education
Evaluation Questions

EDSP 387 **J. Thousand**
Fall 1995 **9 students reporting**

1. WHAT *TO YOU WERE THE MOST BENEFICIAL ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE?*

The projects were very beneficial.

Conflict resolution in clear well defined terms. Creative problem solving awareness plans were excellent.

Jacque gave us a great semester. She is an effective educator--and the most beneficial aspect of the course.

The sections of collaborative teaming were very helpful and interesting in my present situation.

Most beneficial is how Jacque presents her material. She does it in a fun way that promotes memory of the material. Information is intertwined nicely throughout the course.

Classroom discussions.

Practical application and practice.

Base teams and class discussions.

I have been supervising people for 20 years, yet this is the first course I've taken that addresses supervision techniques!

2. WHAT *ASPECTS OF THE COURSE DO YOU FEEL SHOULD BE IMPROVED UPON OR DELETED? PLEASE INDICATE REASON FOR IMPROVEMENT OR DELETIONS.*

None.

Transparencies are usually redundant.

None.

None.

3. DO *YOU FEEL THAT ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE COURSE? IF SO, PLEASE INDICATE THESE ACTIVITIES.*

No.

Maybe some EEE examples.

Very activity-oriented.

No.

4. WOULD *YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE TO OTHER STUDENTS? WHY?*

Yes--opportunities to apply knowledge.

Yes.

Most definitely.

Yes. Definitely. Tons of helpful information for teachers. It really added much to my repertoire.

Yes! Very lively, helpful, informative and fun!

Yes!

Yes--helps to expand professional skills like supervision and communication. Very fun and effective way to learn.

Yes, I really learned a lot. Terrific class!!

Yes. J. Thousand practices what she preaches; she models thru teaching and class requirements what she wants us to do in the real world!

Survey: Education Course Evaluation

Report: Frequency Text (Subgroup Only)

Date: Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Respondent Selection:

Respondents in Batches:

EDSP 387 Thousand Fall 95: 9

No subgroups selected.

Item: 1

Text: Objective clarified by Instructor

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	9	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 2

Text: Organization of Course

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	7	77.8%
Agree Somewhat	4	2	22.2%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.78
Std Dev:	0.44
Median:	5.00

Item: 3

Text: Knowledge of subject

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	9	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%

No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 4

Text: Interest in Subject

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	9	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 5

Text: Intellectual Stimulation

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	8	88.9%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	11.1%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing: 0
Mean: 4.89
Std Dev: 0.33
Median: 5.00

Item: 6

Text: Assignments

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	7	77.8%
Agree Somewhat	4	2	22.2%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.78
Std Dev:	0.44
Median:	5.00

Item: 7

Text: Ability to arouse interest

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	8	88.9%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	11.1%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.89
Std Dev:	0.33
Median:	5.00

Item: 8

Text: Skill in guiding the learning process

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	8	88.9%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	11.1%

No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing: 0
Mean: 4.89
Std Dev: 0.33
Median: 5.00

Item: 9

Text: Presentation of Subject

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	9	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 10

Text: Fairness in Grading

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	9	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 11

Text: Willingness to help

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	9	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 12

Text: Attitude toward Students

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	8	88.9%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	11.1%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.89
Std Dev:	0.33
Median:	5.00

Item: 13

Text: Personal attention to Student product

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	9	100.0%
Agree Somewhat	4	0	0.0%

No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 14

Text: General estimate of the teacher

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	8	88.9%
Agree Somewhat	4	1	11.1%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.89
Std Dev:	0.33
Median:	5.00

Item: 15

Text: General Estimate of the course

Subgroup: N/A (9 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Agree Strongly	5	6	66.7%
Agree Somewhat	4	3	33.3%
No Opinion	3	0	0.0%
Disagree Somewhat	2	0	0.0%
Disagree Strongly	1	0	0.0%
		9	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.67
Std Dev:	0.50
Median:	5.00

Survey: SPED Practicum Evaluation #2

Report: Frequency Text (Subgroup Only)

Date: Tuesday, May 07, 1996

Respondent Selection:

Respondents in Batches:

EDSP319 Fall 95: 5

No subgroups selected.

Item: 1

Text: Faculty supervisor is available for consultation

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	4	80.0%
Very good	4	1	20.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.80
Std Dev:	0.45
Median:	5.00

Item: 2

Text: Quality of recommendation and ability to refer you to others for appropriate advice

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	4	80.0%
Very good	4	1	20.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.80
Std Dev:	0.45
Median:	5.00

Item: 3

Text: Overall professional behavior, e.g., scheduling necessary meetings, amount of time needed to respond to request for advice, etc.

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%

Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 4

Text: Quality of rapport with you, e.g., friendly, honest, courteous

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%
Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 5

Text: Quality of Faculty Supervisor's knowledge of state and federal special ed requirements

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%
Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%

	5	**Missing:**	0
		Mean:	5.00
		Std Dev:	0.00
		Median:	5.00

Item: 6

Text: Quality of Faculty Supervisor's knowledge of specific instructional interventions

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%
Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 7

Text: Quality of Faculty Supervisor's knowledge of consu8ltation strategies with parents.

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%
Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 8

Text: Quality of Faculty Supervisor's knowledge of transition planning.

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%
Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 9

Text: Quality of Faculty supervisor's knowledge of effective and efficient case management strategies.

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%
Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing:	0
Mean:	5.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	5.00

Item: 10

Text: Quality of Faculty Supervisor's knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	5	100.0%
Very good	4	0	0.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%

5

Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing: 0
Mean: 5.00
Std Dev: 0.00
Median: 5.00

Item: 11

Text: Quality of internship site in regards to providing essential experiences

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	4	80.0%
Very good	4	1	20.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing: 0
Mean: 4.80
Std Dev: 0.45
Median: 5.00

Item: 12

Text: Quality of internship program in regards to meeting instructional needs of the intern

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	4	80.0%
Very good	4	1	20.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing: 0
Mean: 4.80
Std Dev: 0.45
Median: 5.00

Item: 13

Text: Overall impression of the internship experience

Subgroup: N/A (5 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	5	4	80.0%
Very good	4	1	20.0%
Good	3	0	0.0%
Poor	2	0	0.0%
Very poor	1	0	0.0%
		5	

Missing:	0
Mean:	4.80
Std Dev:	0.45
Median:	5.00

1996 Summer

EDSP 200 Strategies for Reaching Angry and Disruptive Students

Total Number of Evaluations Returned = 220

Presenters	Terrible (1)	Bad (2)	Pretty Good (3)	Good (4)	Incredible (5)	Mean
Maynard	0	2	4	3	1	3.3
Merrill	0	0	3	23	13	4.3
Schoenberg	0	0	0	4	3	3.9
Mezzocchi	0	2	1	13	40	4.6
Udis	0	0	4	9	6	4.1
Sbardellati	0	0	2	12	9	4.3
Reid	0	0	3	8	5	4.1
Rubin	0	2	10	12	11	3.9

Overall Evaluation	Terrible (1)	Bad (2)	Pretty Good (3)	Good (4)	Incredible (5)	Mean
Team Time	0	4	21	104	87	4.3
NES Component	1	4	30	88	96	4.3
Week's Content	0	1	21	114	87	4.3
Organization	2	5	45	105	62	4.0

Facilitators	Terrible (1)	Bad (2)	Pretty Good (3)	Good (4)	Incredible (5)	Mean
Nancy Thomas	1	0	3	6	0	3.4
Carolyn Smiles	0	0	0	2	6	4.8
Karen Vanderlip	0	1	2	1	1	3.4
Chigee Cloninger	0	0	0	7	9	4.6
Pat Collier	0	0	0	5	5	4.5
Sue Degener	0	0	3	8	0	3.7
Susan Edelman	0	0	0	3	0	4.0
Debbie Gould	0	1	2	9	3	3.9
Nancy McDonald	0	2	1	7	4	3.9
Jon Udis	0	0	1	6	2	4.1
Mary Young	0	0	0	4	7	4.6
Jim Merrill	0	0	0	2	4	4.7
Ginny Iverson	0	0	1	5	3	4.2
Mary Pat Mcnulty	2	2	2	4	1	3.0
Howard	0	0	2	4	4	4.2
Rich Reid	0	0	0	1	1	4.5
Mary Ellen Seaver Reid	0	0	0	5	4	4.4
Mike Mezzocchi	0	0	0	6	4	4.4
Jane Reese Scott	0	3	2	1	3	3.4
Joanne Unruh	0	0	0	2	2	4.5
Catherine Bell	0	0	0	4	4	4.5

APPENDIX B

Graduate Survey Highlights

INTEGRATION FACILITATOR GRADUATE SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

Inclusive of the first graduating class of IFs in 1988, 60 students have been accepted and enrolled in the IF CAS program.

Of Vermont's 340 schools, 60 are supported part-time or full-time by 45 of the 60 graduates of the IF CAS program. These schools are located in every corner of Vermont. The other graduates of the IF CAS program currently offer leadership service in other ways. Specifically, five now provide leadership as general or special education administrators in five supervisory unions, four teach general education classrooms that welcome ISE learners, one coordinates home-school relations for ISE and other learners for a supervisory union, another is a professional foster care parent for ISE learners, and three work out of state in service to ISE and other special education eligible learners. One graduate has retired and volunteers service. Currently, of 60 of Vermont's 340 schools are supported part-time or full-time by graduates of the IF CAS program.

IF direct caseloads average 12 ISE learners. Service delivery characteristics of IF CAS graduates reveal that with team teaching, consultation, and team planning responsibilities with general educators, dozens of other general education students were supported by each IF.

An important activity for IF program graduates has been to support State Department of Education, State I-Team, and the UAP of Vermont to provide local school staff and community members with training regarding best practices, the rationale supporting them, and the technical skills to implement them. Annually, from 200 to 350 parents, school personnel, students, and human service personnel have taken advantage of the intensive week-long Summer Leadership Institute which is staffed by IF trainees and graduates. In conjunction with the State I-Team, IFs have developed and taught courses that replicate or expand upon the content delivered in Summer Leadership Institutes. The UAP's paraeducator training program has relied heavily upon graduates of the IF CAS program to deliver training modules and coursework to paraeducators in their local school regions. In the past 10 years, IF graduates have supplemented I-Team and paraeducator training services through joint delivery of courses to over 1000 educators, paraeducators, and parents across the State of Vermont.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTEGRATION FACILITATOR GRADUATE SURVEY
PROGRAM AND CURRENT JOB INFORMATION

A. What year did you graduate from the Integration Facilitator Graduate Concentration?_____

B. What is the title of your current position?_____

C. What was the title of your position when you entered the graduate program?_____

D. Annually, to how many people do you provide consultation, technical assistance, workshops, courses regarding inclusionary educational practices, accommodating for student diversity, effective teaching, and/or discipline models that teach responsibility?

Consultation and Technical Assistance _____

Workshops an/or Courses _____

E. For how many students do you provide support? _____

F. What percent of these students for whom you provide support are fully integrated (80% or more time in regular classes or the local community)?_____

F. What was the greatest impact of the program on you in your educational role?

G. What was the greatest impact of the program on the children you serve and their families?

H. What was the greatest impact of the program on the schools?

I. Other comments?

PLEASE COMPLETE THE REST OF THE SURVEY ON THE OPTICAL SCAN DATA SHEET

Directions: Starting with number one on the data sheet, for each item, mark the letter on the data sheet which seems most appropriate or write in the box indicated. Do not write on this form. Use the data sheet only. Do not sign your name to the data sheet. PLEASE DO NOT FOLD OR CRUMBLE THE DATA SHEET.

1. Under what categories are the students you are serving eligible for special education? **(Mark the appropriate letters next to the Number 1 on the data sheet.)**

Learning Impairment	A
Learning Disability	B
Emotional Disturbance	C
Multihandicap	D
Other	E

(If you choose other, please describe in Write In Area Number 1)

2. What age group(s) do you primarily serve? **(Mark the appropriate letters next to the Number 2 on the data sheet.)**

Preschool	A
Elementary	B
Middle school	C
Secondary	D
Other	E

(If you choose other, please describe in Write In Area Number 2)

3. The program played a role in making you effective in your current positions?

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. The program helped you function more effectively in the field of education?

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

5. The program influenced your professional goals in the field of education?

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

THE PROGRAM PLAYED A ROLE IN MAKING YOU MORE EFFECTIVE IN:

6. Working with families

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

7. Planning inclusionary programs and accommodations for students

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

8. Providing technical assistance and consultation to others

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

9. Providing workshops, courses, and other instruction for adults

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

THE PROGRAM PLAYED A ROLE IN MAKING YOU MORE EFFECTIVE IN:

10. Using instructional strategies (e.g., cooperative and partner learning) and discipline approaches that promote inclusion, heterogeneous grouping, active learning, and the development of social skills and personal responsibility

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

11. Supervising and coaching other educators, paraeducators, and/or volunteers

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

12. Changing organizational structures, policies, procedures, and service delivery models so that support could be provided to all children in general education

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

13. Transforming the general education environment so it is welcoming and supportive or students with diverse needs

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

14. Increasing the number of students fully included (80% or more time in general education)

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

15. Enhancing your colleagues' interest and ability to include students with diverse needs in general education

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE INTEGRATION FACILITATOR PROGRAM INFLUENCE THE SCHOOLS IN WHICH YOU WORKED:

16. The schools (e.g., teachers and administrators) are more supportive of educating all students in regular education

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

17. More students with learning and behavioral challenges are included in regular education

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

18. Students with learning and behavioral challenges included in regular education receive better services

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

19. There are better home school relationships and support for families of children with disabilities

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

20. Policies and procedures are more supportive of inclusion

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

21. The service delivery model is more supportive of inclusion

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

22. The school climate is more supportive of inclusion

Very True			Very Untrue	Don't Know
A	B	C	D	E

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Integration Facilitator Graduate Survey
Program and Current Job Information

A. **What year did you graduate from the Integration Facilitator Graduate Concentration?**

1995
1993
1993
1992

1994
1989
1991
Spring '92
1992
1993
May '94
1990
1988
1994
1994
1992
1992
1992
1989
1990
1990
1992
1990 or 1991
will graduate May '96
1993
1993
1992
1990
October 1994
1993
1992
1990
Did not send back written survey

B. **What is the title of your current position?**

Special Services Coordinator
Integration Facilitator
Special Education (I basically act as a Learning Specialist/Integration Facilitator)
Special Education Coordinator
Learning Center teacher
Coordinator of Special Ed.
Resource Teacher
5th grade teacher
Special Educator
Coordinator of Special Services
Special Educator
Integration Facilitator/Adaptive Physical Educator
Assistant Principal
Integration Facilitator
Consulting Teacher/Learning Specialist
Consulting Teacher/Special Educator
CT/LS
Middle school special educator
Integration facilitator
Integration specialist
Assistant Principal
Special Ed. Admin.
Special Educator
Integration Facilitator (2 days per week)
Inclusion Facilitator
Physical Therapist
Teacher in Rochester, VT
Learning Specialist
Integration Facilitator
Integration Specialist
Classroom teacher
Integration Facilitator
Did not return write-in questions

C. **What was the title of your position when you entered the graduate program?**

Special education consultant
Special educator
Same (LS/IF)
Consulting teacher/special education coordinator
Integration facilitator
Teacher
Commissioner designated; level 1-2 teacher
Integration facilitator
Special educator
Special ed. teacher
Resource teacher
Adaptive physical educator
Integration specialist
Coordinator-Essential Early Education
Same as above (CT/LS)
Classroom teacher
CT/LS
Grade 5 teacher
Paraprofessional
Teacher of the multi-handicapped
Teacher of EBD
Special educator
Special educator
Didn't exist
Inclusion facilitator
Physical therapist
Teacher in Rochester, VT
Learning specialist
Special education/integration facilitator
Special educator
Special educator
Learning skills teacher
Did not answer write-ins

D. **Annually, to how many people do you provide consultation, technical assistance, workshops, courses regarding inclusionary educational practices, accommodating for student diversity, effective teaching, and/or discipline models that teach responsibility?**

Consultation and Technical Assistance
Workshops and/or courses

100+/100+
100/35 (faculty at MHS)
daily 9 teachers; inservice training 2 times
50+/-; 25+/-
10;--
60/150
--/--
50+/0
50-60/1 or 2
10/90
25/5
40-50/25-30
30/0
15-20/6-10 my school; have done out of state workshops for 60+
10+/- estimates; 5+/-
30-40/25-30
100+/-;100+/-
approx. 15 per year;--
50+/15 (in future planning stage)
approx. 50; average a couple a year
none now
30 ongoing;100-200
varies, consult daily; 0
50+/15+
50+;20+ middle school staff, 20+ paraeducators, 40+ conference
25-30/--
my colleagues (8 people); none, but would like to
12/0
approximately 50/25-50
3 elementary schools and a high school in my district/--
--/--
25/1
did not fill out write-ins

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

E. **For how many students do you provide support?**

100+
25
20-30
150+/-
35-40
12
5 students as Service Manager, many more, up to 30, thru Resource Services
25
15-22 yearly
100
50
16 (case manager or co-case manage 9)
--
6
9 students on childcount and approximately 45-50 students on Title I. Providing support is primarily to classroom teachers.
Approx. 25
30+/-
Currently 30
13+
10
None now
Indirect 220
15
10-12
4 caseload; many more on consulting basis and various other support modes
10-15
70--all m.s. students; 20 high school students
Over 30
8 direct, 15-20 consulting
10 direct support-Case Manager; 10 Consultations; presently will increase as year goes on
--
10
--

F. **What percent of these students for whom you provide support are fully integrated (80% or more time in regular classes or the local community)?**

100%
96%
100%
99%
95%
75%
100%
100%
90% classroom, 100% community
80%
100%
100%

100%
100%
100%
100%
99%
100%
100%

100% are integrated (220)
13
All but 3--one home tutored--medically frail. Two in and out of classes due to extreme behavior problems.
3
95%
All
100%
All of them.
95%

65%

F(2). What was the greatest impact of the program on you in your educational role?

It made me aware of current best practices and helped my thinking evolve as to appropriate programming for all students.

Better able to handle the skills needed for interagency coordination.

Helped me to work with diverse groups of people; to increase my skills at guiding meetings to a successful close.

-Enhancement of collaborative/facilitation skills
-Expansion of creative thinking
-Increased confidence
-Knowing what resources are out there and how to find them
-Building a network of professional support
-Improved ability to articulate philosophy-advocate for students and their families

My skills as a teacher of students with diverse needs and learning styles were greatly enhanced. I became more proficient at adapting regular curriculum to accommodate students' individual skills, as well as at developing curriculum to teach needed skills not offered in the scope of "regular" classes. Perhaps most importantly, I became connected to a statewide network of educators, parents, and young people committed to fully inclusive public education.

It has been to have the opportunity of building a model. Now other people are following the idea and implementing it.

It gave me the skills to leave the job as a self-contained teacher and to facilitate the successful inclusion of students who were traditionally placed in self-contained classrooms. I was fortunate to have become involved early enough to take a leadership role in the transition to an integrated system.

The program taught me the confidence to advocate for my philosophical beliefs concerning heterogeneous groupings. It also taught me to collaborate with my team.

Consultation skills, fund knowledge, cooperative group, team skills

Advocacy, building a continuance of services/options

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I believe the greatest impact on my performance of my role within our school was the increase in collaborative teaming skills I achieved and was able to help others develop. I also feel that my programming and teaching skills improved dramatically, but I don't see these as the areas of greatest impact as they don't have the potential to reach as many students as my increased collaborative teaming skills do.

Enabled me to change my role in my school and be a licensed special educator. This enabled me to move into the new Integration Facilitator position. I started off 50% IF and 50% APE and am currently 75% IF and 25% APE.

Opportunity to discuss "systems" issues and the acquisition of meaningful and useful communication skills.

I feel that the program made me more effective in the development of meaningful evaluation plans and IEP's. As special educators, we were writing evals and IEP's that were not meaningful or useful to anyone but ourselves. The program along with a new SPED process helped me to improve my facilitation skills. During the past year I have been involved in a number of statewide trainings on the SPED process.

Specific info applicable in schools:
-Matrix of IEP goals in classroom schedule (COACH)
*Adaptations & accommodation planning
-Collaborative process
-Planning for students with behavioral challenges
-MAPS
-Special Ed law and assessment procedures
...and the 4 day/week internship provided "hands on" experiences. The program literally freed me from engaging in an educational program that systematically labeled and segregated children with disabilities. I now have the tools to back my philosophy of equity for all.

1. Adult collaboration/communication skills
2. Technical/program know-how

The program enabled me to develop a strong philosophical foundation for inclusion. This, in turn, enabled me to foster that philosophy in my school and gave me the tools to be able to support parents, teachers, students. It taught me how to make the philosophy a reality.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Schools trust you to know what you are doing--UVM has a very strong reputation for excellence in the public schools. Coming in as a para and going out with Special Ed. certification and a CAS was tremendous, and put me immediately into a professional role. The program at UVM gave me expertise in the field upon whom I can rely for guidance and help when needed. This professional support has been most important, both in being able to call upon people in the program at UVM for assistance, and in the professional contacts I made with other special educators throughout the state. I would probably not be a professional special educator now if it were not for the people at UVM and the IF program.

The greatest impact for me was my own integration into the school district. Like my students, I had been confined to a single room all day. As a result of being in the program, integrating students from my classroom, I became more involved in school and district activities.

Increased skill levels that can be generalized to many settings. As very comprehensive understanding of schools and how change does and does not happen--this info can be applied over and over again. In short, the program resulted in me being <u>much</u> more informed and skilled.

After completion of my graduate program, I felt much more capable of assisting students with multiple handicapping conditions in the mainstream.

This is an <u>excellent</u> program. It has provided me with an array of tools to deal with the many problems that arise (and they <u>do</u> arise). It also gave me resources and support in what can be a very lonely position. It was definitely one of the best educational programs I've ever taken! The school district--6 schools--is fully supportive so far!

Resources, applied learnings, methods and strategies.

I was able to work more collaboratively with regular educators to develop adaptations they were willing to use and they began coming to me for support when they were able to see that a child wasn't as involved as they felt he/she could be. Ownership of the children and their education increased dramatically. I was also able to impart/model collaborative teaming with the SPED staff; as we all became more comfortable, they were able to model this approach with their own student teams. IST's are stronger.

It provided a knowledge and research base to effect change that would benefit all students. Instructional practices as well as systems changes were encouraged and supported. In Rochester everything was field-tested in my classroom.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Assisted and provided support in restructuring self-contained special ed. classroom and pullout resource room.

I have tools that are specific and specialized that help keep our kids fully integrated. As a result of these skills our district doesn't need to hire out. The collaborative intensive and peer skills.

When I began the program I was a special educator at the elementary school level. I am now serving students from first grade through high school both directly and as a consultant. I will stay as case manager for some of our students from first grade through graduation from high school. Teachers are now more willing to include all students in their classes because I am helping them to accommodate for "student diversity."

N/A

The philosophical background and problem solving strategies and sessions we had.

G. **What was the greatest impact of the program on the children you serve and their families?**

It helped prepare me for the responsibilities I currently assume, thereby, serving students and families better.

Interpersonal skills training.

I became a stronger, more knowledgeable advocate for my students and their families. Parents are more involved in and aware of their child's educational program.

-Increased access to resources.
-Improved planning.
-More creative programming
-Better instructional strategies (cooperative group learning, peer tutoring, partner learning)

I think the connection to a network of people who believed in their (and their children's) rights and abilities to be an integral part of their schools and communities was a huge gain. I saw many young people gain the respect and friendship of their peers, teachers, and communities--a joy that would have been impossible had they remained segregated in "special" programs.

That the children would no longer be segregated from their age peers in their hometown schools. That their families began to feel that their children were accepted members of their communities. Not all families believed that their children would receive as good an education outside the self-contained room.

I can advocate for them, support them, and basically communicate better with them.

I was a better broker of services.

The role the family has in the child's educational process.

The greatest impact on children and their families, I believe, is the increase in opportunities for parents to be involved that came about through my participation in the program and the simultaneous involvement in the Best Practices course offered in our school during my graduate year. I was able to help the local teams establish some new and highly effective approaches to parent participation.

It enabled me to serve the children in a different role, that of advocate and team member. It also means that the families and students will have a consistent team member throughout their school career.

Strategies for empowerment rather than enablement and tools to facilitate integration.

Collaborative teaming, problem solving.

I feel I have a better understanding of parents and their feelings about working with teams of school personnel. I can honestly state that the parents I work with have left meeting knowing that we were all working together for the child.

The children continue to receive directed instruction in areas of need. More academic and behavioral accommodations are made as I have been more able to direct teachers in that area. Families continue to want the best support for their children. Act 230 has helped destigmatize services.

Recognition that their complex programs required/deserved skilled professional attention, and that by designating a person coordinate/ train/suppport their teams, the instruction of all students increased in quality.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I have spent the last three years working in Special Ed as a Learning Specialist--I served many students with various support needs. My data on these sheets currently reflects my position as a 5th grade teacher. I am on a one-year leave of absence to model inclusion--adaptations, collaborative teaming, accommodations, social skills, etc. This would not be a possibility or desire had it not been for your program.

-Network; professional gatherings.
-Always 'being there' when I get into a corner and all I have to do is call.

Perhaps the most significant impact of my participation in the program is yet to come. This year a special education from our Middle School is enrolled in the program. Her participation was possible because of the success we experienced through my participation. Our Middle School is very established as a departmentalized school--each subject area is taught during a "period" and special education students spend much more time in the special education programs than they do in our school. This creates confusion and some hostility for too many parents and students. It is my hope that her participation in the program will help bring about some changes at that level. Then maybe our schools can work together to provide models and supports for other schools in the district!

I couldn't have participated in the program without the grant due to my financial and family responsibilities. It also motivated my district to allow me to participate!

I am very fortunate that the administration supports inclusion of all students. We have developed a rapport with the classroom teachers and share responsibility for students. I feel that it is important for the program to focus on students with behavioral issues. This group is currently presenting the greatest challenge to our schools. It is also important for successes in Vermont in the area of inclusion to be shared with schools who are struggling to make it work.

I am happier in this position than I have ever been in 10 years of teaching. I am able to work directly with children, model teaching strategies, and be a member of a collaborative team that supports all children because of my credentials earned through the inc. facilitator program.

I saw children (middle school age) taking charge of their learning with an initial step of advocating/planning for their peers with intensive needs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I definitely have a different outlook and complete respect for families of the children I work with than do many of my colleagues. Professionals are very quick to blame the family and often don't see them as an essential part of the working team. Knowing who to call in the state for family support is essential to building and maintaining a good working relationship. UVM's program was very strong in this area, unlike so many other SPED programs in the State of VT--just one area of many that make UVM's IF program so different...and successful in creating special educators who are working to make all children successful in school.

I cannot point to any one single impact. I'll share highlights that were commented on:
-Increased alertness/awareness of the student
-Increased interactions of classmates in the community and school
-Family comments that they never want to go back to a self-contained class.

Belief and the associated skills to make schools and communities more inclusive. Skills in communication and perspective taking--I'm better able.

My students are more fully integrated into the mainstream, and I have wrap around services to support my students and families.

Additional resources, team-building skills have benefited everyone, also consultation and cooperative learning skills.

Team collaboration and being pro-active. Building on strengths.

Parents and students feel much more a part of the educational process. Student involvement and belonging has increased in their classes.

Strategies for success, new discipline model K-12, cooperative learning, effective team meetings, and an overall building change in the school.

Social acceptance. Communication and family support through teaming.

I have a level of expertise and a network of colleagues that I didn't previously have. As a result, I can keep families connected to their child's program as they are experts about the child, while coordinating appropriate services.

For some, staying on as case manager throughout their children's schooling. For all, including families and children in their educational planning/goals--ex., using the maps process, the ability to see beyond the classroom to the community and use all resources available.

NA

Working for a student as a team including student, parents, teachers, other agencies and consultants.

H. **What was the greatest impact on the program on the schools?**

It helped me to provide a progressive vision for the school programs and equipped me with skills and tools to help actualize vision.

I'm not sure, to be honest.

I became a more effective team member, and have served on a variety of school and district committees. I believe I've helped the adults I work with become more committed to meeting the needs of all learners in the mainstream.

Combination of F&G. Also, other folks have gone through the program, and we have had interns--broadens base of knowledge--expands capacity of schools to reach needs of all kids.

Teachers, administration, and staff came to see the goal of full inclusion for all students as attainable--and viewed themselves as vital contributors to that end. While this level of support was by no means 100%, the overall climate of the schools became more welcoming of diversity.

It has been in the perception of the "regular kids" about differences and tolerance. In a context of violence and individualism, this point represents a living way to teaching values.

They became responsible for the education of all the children in their town. I was able, at first, to assist schools in meeting that responsibility, they needed to change their services, staff, etc., to take on the responsibility. The impact that the 'program' had on the schools was training me to help implement the best practice and the law.

-Heterogeneous groupings
-Faculty/staff education
-Celebration/grieving
-Teaming

Integration in classes--less pullout.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Integration!

I can only speak to the impact on my school. There are 11 schools serving four towns in my district. The philosophies, service delivery models and programming considerations are different in each school. At Central Elementary School we have evolved into a totally inclusive school. Our "special education classroom" has become a skills center staffed by special educators who work with small groups of children during reading, writing and math blocks throughout the day. We do not only work with children on IEPs, nor are all children on IEPs placed in the skills center for their instruction. We have really eliminated the boundaries and find that all of our students (and teachers) are experiencing more success! I feel that my participation in the program and sharing ideas and resources with my school on a regular basis, in addition to a very strong, supportive principal, have had a part in making this transition successful.

The program made it possible for my district to release me the one day/week I needed in order to complete the program.

Awareness, understanding and appreciation for diversity.

Students with severe disabilities were able to receive an appropriate education in regular classrooms with same aged peers.

Skills/information I learned in the program were carried back to the adults I work with, both the regular educators and the special educators. I was able to develop leadership skills and use them around issues involving special education. We have tried in our system to allow teachers time to discuss issues in education that effect all of us.

It is a continual process of examining and evaluation what and how effectively we teach all children. Inclusionary practices heighten our staff's awareness of teaching to all children on a continuum of learning styles and abilities.

It changed teachers' views of what education is--in some cases to a much broader definition. It supported teachers in their efforts to introduce/increase best instructional practices in their rooms and schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

People are very pleased to hear you have been specifically trained as an IF--parents especially want to know about the program and are pleased with the broad range of knowledge you are exposed to through the programs. My school staff was reluctant a few years ago about supporting such a role--people now tell me that it is an essential position--the glue that holds programs and children's success together. The public schools are getting more and more children w/various handicapping conditions. A balanced Federal budget would be easier to imagine than a school effectively serving these children without an IF. Communication in a busy school is impossible at best--children's programs, accommodations, inclusion and success would be the first to suffer. Classroom teachers are expected to be experts in all fields for all kids--without the support, expertise, and guidance from an IF, the job really would be impossible. UVM's IF program must survive and continue. Without such a professional prep. program, special educators will not be able to provide successful programs for all children. Their experience, knowledge, and ability to communicate is essential for a school's programs--both for staff and for children.

It has been an incredible learning experience for all adults in the schools. What amazes me is that it continues to be with each new student that comes in with their particular set of challenges. Many staff members are much more sensitive and aware of students.

The more we integrate students into the mainstream, the more comfortable school personnel are with working with students with diverse needs.

They were able to relax, knowing someone with some level of expertise, was in the district to help.

Problem solving skills and team collaboration skills. Building on strengths.

Teachers feel more involved and supported. They are more open with thoughts and creative with ideas.

An entire system change--namely the discipline system. Support from the University for new ideas and feedback as to what were were already doing.

Eliminated self-contained classrooms.

To have a training expert in the building who knows Special Ed law, can test/evaluate, who can facilitate collaborative team meetings, plan intensive programming, support classroom teachers, etc...

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Most teachers are now more than willing to take all students into their classrooms because I am able to either work directly with their students, suggest alternate methods of programming and show them how to accommodate for individual differences.

N/A

Our school tries very hard to include all students.

I. Other comments?

It was a good model for a teacher training program. Given the structure, participants could apply what they learned immediately.

When you go into a program like this, you have certain goals in mind. However, what you get out of it is so much more. Working with small, close-knit group of people, to problem solve, discuss new learnings, and practice skills was very effective in keeping me to grow and mature as an educator. Suggestion: one of the greatest challenges facing us now in integration is keeping our behaviorally challenged students in the mainstream. It would be helpful if the IF program could include more instruction re EBD students.

A life-altering experience! I can't say enough about how beneficial it has been.

The job is not done! Our schools continue to face an increasing population of challenged and challenging young people. Much more training and consultation are needed to facilitate the systemic change necessary to effectively educate our students in <u>every</u> school and community in Vermont.

In my country we are trying to take advantages of the inclusive model in education in order to rescue part of our cultural values of solidarity and fraternity. My job is to put those pieces together in the mind of teachers and administrators; I'm surprised how fast they can understand it.

I went through the program as one of the first classes. The structure and focus has changed and evolved quite a lot over the years. In the early years it was absolutely essential to have the training and support of the program and the staff. It should continue to evolve and exist.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We have recently had a change in our administration. This change has been positive and the support our students and faculty are receiving has allowed us to have our students participate more fully in the school.

Just good luck--it's too valuable to lose.

I feel extremely fortunate to have had the grand opportunity to earn a Master's Degree in Special Ed/Intensive needs (Inclusion Facilitation). I have benefited, the students I serve have benefited and therefore our world has benefited. I would not have had this experience if it were not for this program.

Due to budget cuts, my role as a Special Educator with skills in integration has been eliminated. I continue to serve the same student population (for the most part) as a physical therapist, and therefore continue to model collaborative skills and foster inclusionary practices as a team member. Because I am still on staff, I have been able to continue providing resources and verbal input to our new principal as he seeks to improve our disciplinary policies and improve inclusion of behaviorally challenged students. I also can continue to use my training to support families and advocate for continued change toward better inclusion. I indicated several answers as B. This is true only because it has not been long enough for our district's mature staff to fully embrace the principles the program and I espouse; but there has been movement in the right direction. Change is never fast enough. My advocacy for inclusion began as a physical therapist, with the educational process and component/knowledge/skill, I can continue to impact the process for inclusion of all students no matter what my official position in the district.

I miss it. Change is hard to do alone when isolated in small towns. Support and new information is needed to keep things fresh.

The program was an asset to me. It smoothed out my ever rough corners and made me a more learned, global facilitator.

I have probably become the strongest advocate for mainstreaming--with the proper supports--that our district has. This program was probably the best educational experience for me and one that I got the most from as far as usage that I've ever had. The advantage of meeting each week with other educators and discussing our different educational experiences cannot be overlooked. I miss those shared times.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The survey questions are very difficult to answer. During and after my coursework the school really took on the challenge of inclusion. Currently, with the numbers of students increasing, the IF's of students with challenges increasing and the $ for funding, #'s of teachers and space decreasing, the inclusion of students presenting significant challenges is becoming increasingly difficult. I feel my answers are on the fence. The intent of inclusion is there. The realities are becoming difficult to implement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey: IF Survey 1998

Report: Frequency Test

Date: Wednesday, November 29, 1998

Respondent Selection:

Respondents in Batches:

IF Survey 1998: 33

No subgroups selected.

Item: 1

Text: Under what categories are the students you are serving eligible for special education?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Very Often Impair.	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Somewhat Often Emo.	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sometimes Other	2	2	[illegible]	2	50.0%

Subgroup: N/A (28 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Often Disability	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Very Often Multi.	3	2	[illegible]	2	50.0%
		4		4	

Subgroup	
Missing:	29
Mean:	1.50
Std Dev:	0.58
Median:	1.50

Item: 2

Text: What age group(s) do you primarily serve?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Very Often Preschool	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Somewhat Often Middle	3	4	[illegible]	4	25.0%
Don't Know Other	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Subgroup: N/A (28 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Often Elem.	4	0	[illegible]	0	68.3%
Very Often Secondary	5	3	[illegible]	3	18.8%
		16		16	

Subgroup	
Missing:	17
Mean:	3.38
Std Dev:	0.81
Median:	4.00

Item: 3

Text: The program played a role in making you effective in your current positions?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Very True	5	25	78.1%	25	78.1%
Somewhat True	3	1	3.1%	1	3.1%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Subgroup: N/A (28 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
True	4	6	18.8%	6	18.8%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		32		32	

Subgroup	
Missing:	1
Mean:	4.75
Std Dev:	0.51
Median:	5.00

Item: 4

Text: The program helped you function more effectively in the field of education?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Very True	5	25	75.8%	25	75.8%
Somewhat True	3	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Subgroup: N/A (28 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
True	4	7	21.2%	7	21.2%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.73
Std Dev:	0.52
Median:	5.00

Item: 5

Text: The program influenced your professional goals in the field of education?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Very True	5	24	72.7%	24	72.7%
Somewhat True	3	3	9.1%	3	9.1%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Subgroup: N/A (28 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
True	4	6	18.2%	6	18.2%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.64
Std Dev:	0.65
Median:	5.00

Item: 6

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in working with families?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Very True	5	16	48.5%	16	48.5%
Somewhat True	3	2	6.1%	2	6.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

Subgroup: N/A (28 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
True	4	14	42.4%	14	42.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.33
Std Dev:	0.88
Median:	4.00

Item: 7

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in planning inclusionary programs and accommodations for students?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
Very True	5	28	84.8%	28	84.8%
Somewhat True	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Subgroup: N/A (28 respondents)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup Percent
True	4	5	15.2%	5	15.2%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.85
Std Dev:	0.36
Median:	5.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item: 8

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in providing individual assistance and consultation to others?

Very True	5	20	60.6%	20	60.6%
Somewhat True	3	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Item: 9

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in providing workshops, courses, and other instruction for adults?

Very True	5	14	42.4%	14	42.4%
Somewhat True	3	5	15.2%	5	15.2%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

Item: 10

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in using instructional strategies and disciplinary approaches that promote inclusion, heterogeneous grouping, active learning, and the development of social skills and personal responsibility.

Very True	5	26	78.8%	26	78.8%
Somewhat True	3	3	9.1%	3	9.1%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Item: 11

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in supervising and coaching other educators, paraeducators, and/or volunteers

Very True	5	20	60.6%	20	60.6%
Somewhat True	3	3	9.1%	3	9.1%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Item: 12

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in changing organizational structures, policies, procedures and service delivery models so that support could be provided to all children in general education

Very True	5	17	51.5%	17	51.5%
Somewhat True	3	2	6.1%	2	6.1%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Item: 13

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in transforming the general education environment so it is welcoming and supportive to students with diverse needs

Very True	5	20	60.6%	20	60.6%
Somewhat True	3	4	12.1%	4	12.1%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Item: 14

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in increasing the number of students fully included (80% or more time in general education)

Very True	5	19	57.6%	19	57.6%
True	4	11	33.3%	11	33.3%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.42
Std Dev:	0.67
Median:	5.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	12	36.4%	12	36.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.58
Std Dev:	0.66
Median:	5.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	12	36.4%	12	36.4%
Very Untrue	2	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.12
Std Dev:	0.99
Median:	4.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	4	12.1%	4	12.1%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.79
Std Dev:	0.64
Median:	5.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	10	30.3%	10	30.3%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.52
Std Dev:	0.67
Median:	5.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	14	42.4%	14	42.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.45
Std Dev:	0.82
Median:	5.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	9	27.3%	9	27.3%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.48
Std Dev:	0.71
Median:	5.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
Somewhat True	3	2	6.1%	2	6.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item: 16

Text: The program played a role in making you more effective in increasing your colleagues' interest and ability to include students with disabilities in general education

Very True	5	19	57.6%	19	57.6%
Somewhat True	3	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
Don't Know	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Item: 16

Text: To what extent did your participation in the integrative facilitator program influence the schools in which you worked: the schools are more supportive of educating all students in regular education

Very True	5	13	39.4%	13	39.4%
Somewhat True	3	2	6.1%	2	6.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

Item: 17

Text: more students with learning and behavioral challenges are included in regular education

Very True	5	17	51.5%	17	51.5%
Somewhat True	3	3	9.1%	3	9.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

Item: 18

Text: students with learning and behavioral challenges included in regular education receive better services

Very True	5	17	51.5%	17	51.5%
Somewhat True	3	3	9.1%	3	9.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

Item: 19

Text: there are better home-school relationships and support for families of children with disabilities

Very True	5	17	51.5%	17	51.5%
Somewhat True	3	2	6.1%	2	6.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

Item: 20

Text: policies and procedures are more supportive of inclusion

Very True	5	16	48.5%	16	48.5%
Somewhat True	3	3	9.1%	3	9.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.0%	1	3.0%

Item: 21

Text: the service delivery model is more supportive of inclusion

Very True	5	18	56.3%	18	56.3%
Somewhat True	3	1	3.1%	1	3.1%
Don't Know	1	1	3.1%	1	3.1%

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	13	39.4%	13	39.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.00
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	4.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	16	48.5%	16	48.5%
Very Untrue	2	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.19
Std Dev:	0.82
Median:	4.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	12	36.4%	12	36.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.33
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	4.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	12	36.4%	12	36.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.33
Std Dev:	0.00
Median:	4.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	13	39.4%	13	39.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.36
Std Dev:	0.64
Median:	4.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	13	39.4%	13	39.4%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		33		33	

Subgroup	
Missing:	0
Mean:	4.39
Std Dev:	0.88
Median:	4.00

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	12	37.5%	12	37.5%
Very Untrue	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		32		32	

Subgroup	
Missing:	1
Mean:	4.44
Std Dev:	0.84
Median:	5.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item: 22
Text: the school climate is more supportive of inclusion

Very True	5	16	53.3%	16	53.3%
Somewhat True	3	1	3.3%	1	3.3%
Don't Know	1	1	3.3%	1	3.3%

Subgroup: N/A (33 respondents)

Response	Weight	Batch Frequency	Batch %	Subgroup Frequency	Subgroup %
True	4	11	36.7%	11	36.7%
Very Untrue	2	1	3.3%	1	3.3%
		30		30	

Subgroup	
Missing	3
Mean	4.33
Std Error	0.33
Median	5.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTEGRATION FACILITATOR SURVEY TRANSCRIPTS

SPECIAL EDUCATION COORDINATORS

L

Has sent about three people through program.
As an outcome was looking to expand the capacity of schools to deal with all learners and for individuals to develop collaborative schools. She definitely expressed that she felt that the outcomes she was looking for were met in a three cases.

Staff that went through program took on leadership roles in district such as support to classroom teachers, presentations at in-services, team teaching, involved in teams looking at re-structuring and changing schools.

The staff who went through the program worked extremely well with students experiencing disabilities, accepting everyone with open arms, problem solving, kids report that they like school to their families

The staff work extremely well with families, very empathetic, often times they are dealing with agencies, rather than parents. Their collaborative skills are excellent. She feels that collaboration is the most critical component in he program. Helps educators not feel so isolated. Program also taught staff to evaluate themselves

Changes:

Very important to continue to have scholarships that districts can afford to send staff.

She was concerned because when they advertised a position this summer, they only had one applicant. She feels that there is a shortage of good people to fill available positions. Continue to need good people.

J

Has sent two people through the program.

She sent people to the IF program because she was looking for staff to develop skills necessary to make system change. Particularly the skill of collaborative teaming, problem solving, integration.

She found that staff who went through the program were able to bring together teams, definitely had the tools to facilitate teams, kids were included in process, regular educators are feeling more involved and empowered. Didn't feel that there was enough preparation to work with low incidence populations.

Staff involved parents much more after program participation.

Thinks that they still need more of a focus on social integration.

With other special educators in the district they are working in a consultative role.

Changes:

More focus on actual accommodation of curriculum, more case study, practical application, modifying activities

Information of working with Instructional Assistants-especially how to supervise.

J

Has sent three people in the district.

There has been a variety of outcomes through participation in program.

One of the program participants has taken on a variety of leadership roles, facilitating things happening, developing a 504 handbook, workshops, TQM trainer for district, facilitated a variety of meetings.

Individual leadership qualities are supported in the program. If you come in with a strong experiential program, the program can support them moving into that role. It is important to have established credibility before the program

There has been a very positive impact on the work these individuals work with families. Individuals are sensitive to families and colleagues- Use of collaboration is important

Individuals are highly oriented toward integration of students. Often they surprise colleagues by suggesting integration where others didn't think it could be done-and they do make it work when they put the right energy into it.

The coordination and collaboration is critical, makes all of the difference when colleagues are skeptical, can help them move past it.

The biggest challenges are with kids with EBD. People from program needed additional in service regarding the inclusion of kids with EBD to be able to support integration for this population. This is the population that is most often at risk for developing alternative programming.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

D

Graduated from program three years ago.

When she started in the programs was looking for strategies to use in the classroom, ways to include all kids. Definitely felt that her needs were met. She is a regular education teacher (previously been special educator). Looking for ways to make inclusion work, felt that what was learned was very applicable to the classroom

Her participation in the program initiated big changes in instructional services. The school went to block scheduling, and heterogeneous programming. They also changed the whole discipline program. Went to using the Glasser Model, utilizing a planning room (K-12). Kids aren't being thrown out anymore.

She felt that she definitely took on a leadership role, the technical support that was provided by the program helped, more powerful than any other technical assistance ever received.

She sees a lot more collaboration between regular and special education.

They're using cooperative learning, MAPS etc.... finds that people are looking at kids in a variety of models.. Information has been shared with everyone, faculty has begun to view kids differently.

It was critical having the support system within the classroom (peers) and access to current research, helps make it work.

Changes:

Like to see a way to provide continued support to people and schools after program participation ends, would recommend the program to anyone

She needs Ph.D.-but needs it to be paid for

N

Graduated in 92 or 93

She was a PT before the program and was becoming more and more involved in integrating students, she wanted to be able to support students integration in a more effective way.

Felt that the program helped immensely. The superintendent was willing to support. Really liked that you went to class and was immediately able to put the skill into practice. Superintendent was more interested in trying new things. District was confident that strategies would work, open to trying new things, and supported their implementation. This made the connection between learning and results more immediate.

Felt that collaborative teaming was the key-shared ownership

Had a big impact on other special educators, they were desperate for information and she was able to provide them with concrete strategies which reinforced and improved her relationships with special educators. A lot of modeling of collaborative teaming, very open to changes.

After her training in the program she was able to take on full case management of kids. After the program she spearheaded the staff being trained in Crisis Prevention and Management which facilitated the staff looking at kids in crisis in a different way.

Assisted in helping families be more effective team members and that they were a part of it, especially around decisions that impact their child.

She felt that classroom teachers that she worked with were able to problem solve better and that teachers developed an increased ownership of the students with disabilities. The teachers developed insight about the kids that was incredible different than the beginning of the year. Were more open to having students with disabilities in the classroom.

Participation in the program reinforced the way services were provided, more provision of services within classrooms-administrative push.

Their district has a very low child count. Try not to label kids, but serve them through the instructional support team

Changes:

Integrate as much of program as possible with courses in regular education division. Feels that teacher preparation is tantamount.

Also need to provide this type of information to regular educators

S

Graduated '92

Outcome-Certification in Sped and training and Integration.

She came in as a paraprofessional and felt that they absolutely met expectations. Felt that it was great training.

Since the program she has taken leadership training in school and district. Particularly around communication issues such as knowing how to facilitate meetings and training others to facilitate communication.

When you come out of the UVM program, people look forward to you knowing what you are doing look to you as a resource. Regular educators especially look to you to have answers. You spend 99% of your day making decisions and acting in a consultative way.

Improvements:

Family piece is ESSENTIAL, people are very quick to blame the parents. She felt that she has done a lot of work to be inclusive with families, especially around their emotional rights. Using COACH has been essential, really needs to be a part of the program.

Everyone is looking at you to be everything: an IF, CT, and SPED. Integration Facilitator is only a piece of what you actually do. Really need specific information about diagnosis and treatment of reading, writing, and math problems. Job is closer to a CT than an IF.

Maybe program needs to look at more than all or nothing in terms of inclusion. There are certain circumstances where kids are so distracted that they can't focus enough to learn, need other options. By using a learning center in their school have decreased referrals to special education.

Needs to be more of a focus on EBD. Particularly some practical aspects of "how to do" information

Program has truly impacted work with kids. She feels much more confident and sees the confidence translated into her work with kids. If you feel confident you can give kids encouragement and approach them in a way that works. Her job is primarily based in the classrooms which makes her accessible to both kids and teachers.

UVM has always been a great resource-you can call anytime and find support and information. The colleagues that went through the program with her continue to be a huge source of support

Without having her type of position in the district they would not be at the same place in terms of inclusion. Her job is absolutely essential especially the skills of teaming and problem solving to facilitate inclusion

L

Graduated in the late 80's

When she started the program she had been a neuropsychologist and wanted training as a special educator. She wanted to catch up on what was happening and was skeptical of inclusion so wanted to see what it was all about.

She really felt that her goals were met through the program, enjoyed all of it, felt that the instructors were organized and put together.

Through the program she began to see and understand the philosophy of inclusion and fully support it.

After the program she was immediately seen as a leader, collaborative teaming was very new at that point and she did a lot of trainings. Also helped the school clarify their mission and vision and reorganization efforts. She did numerous in services districtwide to help get the integration programs off their feet.

She feels that she has been much better able to help parents and schools by helping teams. She developed the individual skills to help.

Her job is 2 days/wk as an integration specialist and 3 days/week as early educator. Gets to see kids all of the way through

With students who are not disabled she works with them on friendship and peer supports, tolerance, awareness, and ability awareness

Other special educators in district, desperate for strategies, she felt like she was able to help.

Improvements:

Direct Instruction Class was not particularly helpful

Addition: needs resources so people can bring news to school around-emergent literacy and link with communication-Cutting edge info.

More info on Emotional Disturbance

M

Graduated in '89, is IF for her district

Outcome-Teaching program that was to be phased out-wanted skills to successfully integrate kids into regular classroom. Also didn't want to be left without a job.

The skills that she felt were most important is : working with teams of adults, really got her comfort level up around that. Collaborative teaming very important.

Through her experiences in the program she became involved in a variety of district wide committees, particularly involved in staff development. She also became the 504 coordinator for all of the elementary schools in the district.

Inclusion, and her support of it is critical for families because all kids automatically start school in kindergarten. Had a family move into district from out of state and called to find out where the special schools were for her child. Was very excited to hear that all kids in Vermont go to the regular classroom.

There has been a varied impact on regular educators, some perceive your role as critical others don't involve you much. Each teacher you work with is unique, like kids. The collaborative skills have been essential, need to be flexible.

Many special educators see and use your expertise in supporting kids in the regular education environment

Changes:

Needs to be current with constantly changing legislation
Continue to stress the importance of teaming
Continue to have a big part of the program be actually focused on making accommodations for kids in the classroom

Should be more focused on teaching reading and regular education classroom techniques . A lot about education in general

The program was a great experience-incredibly supportive way to change job. Great to have people in program to talk to and be supported by others who are going through same experience

B

Finished in June of '93. Is an Integration Specialist.

When started the program she wanted a masters and more info. She wasn't happy with what was happening with kids when sending kids to H.S.

She is now consulting in three different schools.

Other special educators have picked up some of the skills, but not all of it generalizes.

What has been critical is to use specific strategies such as circle of friends.

Improvements: Need more information for severely handicapped kids-strategies for working with kids with extreme behaviors

The best part was getting together with other educators.

She felt that the program clearly prepared her for her job.

The program was important because you just can't plop kids in classrooms-you need someone with skills and expertise to support the classroom teachers.

Without this type of preparation kids might again be sent out of district to D/O programs.

Obviously schools felt the program to be critical also because they released her time for 1 day/week. This had to be approved by the school board.

P

Graduated in '94 is a CT/LS

In the program she was looking for her Masters degree and more information on including kids. Program met these needs

The skill she gained in program helped improve skills around supervising and a wider access to people around the state.

She has taken on a large number of leadership roles, part of this is just inherent to her, and part is the program

Would naturally share what she was learning in the class with the regular educators in the school. Good that are working while going through program

The program made her awareness level change around working with parents

She found that there was a lot of duplication between the CT and IF program-should be more blending of things together.

She would never recommend the program to someone who has not taught in the regular classroom

It would be good to add another course on leadership skills

Great to have all classes on one day

MK

She finished the program in 91-Is an Integration Specialist

She was originally a special class teacher and they were changing her position. The program was her only source of support

The program helped with all of the changes in the school. People who weren't agreeing to look at inclusion were beginning to open their minds

It was very helpful to have site visit at end of program.

The skills she felt were most important were consultation, collaboration, problem solving.

At this time all special educators needed to change and they weren't happy about it, originally she was not "part of them" because she supported inclusion. Within last three years the relationships have improved, they meet monthly. Really working together to support kids.

The program helped in being able to work with parents and adults, ability to address issues and not person and mutually work together.

The cooperative group and problem solving, I-Team involvement, behavioral components, literacy, being able to look to strengths of all kids were best parts of program

Key points not to change: Collaboration, Problem solving, philosophy

Suggestions:

Focus more on issues related to behavior, esp. learning impaired kids with behavior problems and kids with EBD

Without the program, she couldn't have made it through the changes happening in the district. She would have quit job if program hadn't been there to support her.

H

Finished the program in '93

She was looking to increase her level of skill and get a different endorsement on license. She was a adaptive PE instructor and wanted her Intensive Special Education endorsement.

The program provided her with the skills of collaborative teaming, ways to problem solve-particularly dealing with inclusion and accessing assistance

She is the parent of a handicapped child. The program also helped her impact the district where her child is. Felt that before she had a much bigger discrepancy between what she wanted and the district was provided. The program gave her enough confidence and facts to back up expectations.

Professionally the program gave her credibility, skills have helped, especially with middle school staff.

Most useful skills have been collaborative teaming and problem solving.

It has been great to teach kids to do problem solving in class.

The other special educators access her more frequently and she is on more teams that before.

Now she is 75% IF and 25% adaptive PE.

She is supervising paraeducators, need to add some depth to the program.

The training component for paraeducators, seven new people to train, she is just now feeling like things are getting on target with their training

To Add:

Helpful to do work around dealing with grief (If one of the kids you work with dies) your own and the school community

An intrinsic part of the program is experienced educators. Really think that program has worked. Should have a lot of experience before they come into program

Without the program there wouldn't be as many qualified people

IF the program wasn't important, then school districts wouldn't be willing to let people go one day a week

K

Graduated '92-Now special ed coordinator

Started the program because she wanted to develop a rolodex of resources to help teams problem solve with kids and strategies to help move teachers who are afraid to include kids

The skills that have been most helpful are:facilitation of groups, creative problem solving, ways to expand instructional strategies, cooperative group learning, support from other people in program-still a real support network

The program has had a tremendous impact. Through readings and conversation look at leadership issues. She developed the philosophy that it is not what you do it is how you do it.

It's not just a collection of strategies-it's what it is that you passionately believe in. Need to find a way to get that message out and integrate the information from others to develop a way to go.

Putting it together, need time to talk which was provided in the program. The philisophical component of the program is a component that a lot of different programs wouldn't have

Program helped increase interagency collaboration and involvement with families.

She has shaped her job differently, she spends the majority of her time in schools. Prefers the method of incidental training, hands on involvement with many teams to help facilitate and coordinate.

Feels it is important to have more hands on special ed coordinator. The people who have the best ideas is parent and kids, your job is to help implement.

Because she spends a lot of time in schools people are really interested in the techniques she knows (problem solving etc.)

There has been a large impact on 4 schoolsbecause others have gone through program also and they have had interns

Suggestions:

People are lacking in training in assessment, need people who can do all types-curriculum based assessment, informal, and formal assessment

Definitely loved 1 day/week at center and loved going through with al of the same people-it is important that the format not lose its integrity.

Financial incentives for schools to let a person go one day a week would be helpful on tough financial times